

## REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview on November 25, 2003, in which the allowability of the pending claims has been discussed. In this Amendment, the pending claims have been amended to include limitations placing the pending claims in condition for allowance, as discussed during the telephone interview.

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on August 20, 2003. In this Amendment, claims 1-7, 9-14, 17-20, 22-25, 27-30 and 32 have been amended. Claim 31 has been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11 and 13-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snow, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,550), in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,905) and Jamali (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,501). Claims 4 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snow, et al., in view of Lee and Jamali as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Morita, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,832,470). Claims 6 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snow, et al., Lee and Jamali as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Ho, et al., (Decision Combination in Multiple Classifier Systems, IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence). Claims 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahoney (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,886) in view of Snow, et al.

Snow discloses a method for classifying documents within a class hierarchy. The class hierarchy includes multiple category nodes stored within a tree data structure. Each category node includes a category name and a category definition consisting of defining

terms. A document is classified by finding appropriate categories in the class hierarchy. The document is then stored in these categories. If no category is produced by the search, a system administrator is notified.

Contrary to the presently claimed invention, categories of the class hierarchy in Snow are defined by the user. Specifically, the user in Snow issues various category commands including a command to add a specific category to the class hierarchy, a command to delete a specific category from the class hierarchy, a command to edit a specific category in the class hierarchy, etc. In the presently claimed invention, in contrast, categories or document classes in a document data structure are determined automatically by analyzing the content of documents previously placed in the directories of the document directory structure by the user. For example, as described in the Specification, one embodiment of the present invention determines document classes within a pre-existing directory structure (e.g., a directory structure on the user's hard drive) by locating all directories (e.g., folders) in the pre-existing directory structure, creating a list of all of these directories, filtering files contained in each directory for their content, and determining the document class of the directory based on the content of the documents stored in this directory (Specification, page 13, lines 9-18).

Snow does not teach or suggest the above features of the presently claimed invention. In particular, Snow lacks at least the features contained in the following language of claim 1:

...analyzing content of the documents within the second directory structure to determined a plurality of document classes within the second directory structure;  
determining a document classification profile associated with the first directory structure based on the plurality of document classes...

Similar language is included in independent claims 9, 13, 19, 24 and 29. Thus, independent claims 1, 9, 13, 19, 24 and 29, and their corresponding dependent claims, are patentable over Snow.

Furthermore, each of the additional references cited by the Examiner that include Lee, Jamali, Morita, Ho, and Mahoney does not teach or suggest at least the features of the presently claimed invention that are lacking in Snow.

Accordingly, the presently claimed invention is patentable over the references cited by the Examiner, taken alone or in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 9, 13, 19, 24 and 29, and their corresponding dependent claims, is not rendered obvious by the above references, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Marina Portnova at (408) 720-8300.

**Deposit Account Authorization**

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: November 26, 2003



---

Marina Portnova  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 45,750

Customer No. 008791  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300